

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite the photoinitiator at a concentration of from 0.1 to 0.49% by weight. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification and at least at paragraphs [0011] and [0018]. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not narrowing amendments. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,838,177). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner states on page 2 of the Advisory Action that Applicants' range of 0.1% to 0.95% photoinitiators overlaps the Fenn et al. range of 1% to 8% photoinitiators. Applicants' amended range of 0.1% to 0.49% by weight is not within the Fenn et al. range. The National Institute of Standards and Technology Guide to SI Units states that "[i]f the digit to be discarded is less than 5, the digit preceding the 5 is not changed." See NIST Guide to SI Units, available at <http://physics.nist.gov/Pubs/SP811/appenB.html>, visited September 27, 2006. The Fenn et al. range of 1 to 8% photoinitiator by weight has one significant figure. When rounding Applicants' range of 0.1% to 0.95% by weight according to the NIST guidelines, the significant figure is 0 with respect to the ".1" portion of the 0.1% in the range value and the significant figure is 0 with respect to the ".49" portion of the 0.49% in the range value, as both the ".1" and the ".49" values are less than 5.

Without the photoinitiator concentration of greater than 1%, the Fenn et al. reference does not function according to the teachings, particularly with respect to curing times. Moreover, Fenn et al. teaches that dropping the photoinitiator level below 1% may cause the composition to be tacky following exposure to UV radiation for 1 to 3 minutes. Although it is technically possible to modify Fenn et al. to eliminate the photoinitiator, it is not possible to then provide a non-tacky surface after 2 minutes of radiation as claimed by Applicants. Moreover, eliminating the photoinitiator from Fenn et al. destroys the reference with respect to composition formulations and with respect to the curing times and methodologies. Accordingly, the §103 rejection is improper and claims 1 and 11 and all dependents thereon are patentably distinct from Fenn et al. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Additionally, with respect to Examiner's comments regarding the use of natural light, Applicants respectfully point out that the combination of a low photoinitiator concentration within Applicants' claimed range and natural light is highlighted in Example 3. The Specification at page 9, line 14 reads "Example 3". The Specification at page 10, line 15 is blank. The Specification at page 9, line 16 reads "Primer Cured in Outdoor Natural Light". The Specification at page 9, line 17 reads "The following ingredients were mixed together to form the primer composition." The Specification then shows the table having a photoinitiator in an amount of 0.16 grams. The total primer composition weight is 94.67 grams. The photoinitiator comprises 0.17% of the primer ($0.16/94.67 = .00169$ or 0.17%). Example 3 is the primer composition used in Table 3 and Table 3 demonstrates the adhesion and humidity resistance benefits obtained by using natural light and the low photoinitiator concentration.

Applicants note the Examiner's additional recitation of the Garnett et al, Blatter et al., Awokola et al, and Okada et al. to demonstrate that photoinitiators are known to be effective in amounts below 1% in compositions comprising acrylate-functional components. None of these references alone or in combination, however, disclose Applicants' UV radiation curable primer where the coating is curable to a non-tacky surface under only UVA radiation emitting lamp within 2 minutes and in sunlight within 5 minutes per Applicants' claims as amended.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 29, 2007

By: Anna M. Budde
Anna M. Budde, Reg. No. 35,085

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

AMB/SDJ/tp